



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 223 13-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/748,141	12/27/2000	Yoshihisa Abe	44319-056	3302

7590 09/23/2004
Kenneth L. Cage, Esquire
McDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY
600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, KIMBINH T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2671

DATE MAILED: 09/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/748,141

Applicant(s)

ABE, YOSHIHISA

Examiner

Kimbinh T. Nguyen

Art Unit

2671

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,14,15 and 17-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2,9-13 and 16 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection.

Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Applicant's submission filed on 08/24/04 has been entered.

2. Claims 1-22 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 4-8, 15, 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lobregt (5,559,901).

Claim 1, Lobregt teaches calculating estimation values for surfaces to be deformed (the energy function (velocity and acceleration) is evaluated for the vertex positions; col. 2, lines 17-33) by shrinking edges or surfaces of a polygon model (col. 5, lines 39-50) by converging two or more vertices of the polygon model based on distances between the respective surfaces after each

Art Unit: 2671

deformation (col. 5, lines 26-37; col. 10, lines 15-54) and all of the original vertices before the deformation (the vertices from an initial shape; col. 5, lines 10-24 and col. 11, lines 20-29) involved in the surface deformation; comparing the calculated estimation values with a predetermined permissible value (if during minimization of the energy function an edge length exceeds a first predetermined threshold...if during minimization of the energy function an edge length falls below a second predetermined threshold; col. 13, lines 49-56) or reducing the number of data when the estimation values are equal to or below the predetermined permissible value (if during minimization of the energy function an edge length falls below a second predetermined threshold, the edge and connected vertices are replaced by a single vertex; col. 13, lines 53-56).

Claim 4, Lobregt discloses (the first pass) calculating respective estimation values based on a predetermined estimation method (a first and second predetermined threshold; col. 13, lines 49-56) for a plurality of portions of a polygon model (three shapes 21', 22' and 23'; fig. 5) that are to be deformed by converging two or more vertices of the polygon model (col. 11, lines 31-38); and (the second pass) reducing the number of data for the polygon model by converging two or more vertices of one portion of the polygon model based on the calculated estimation values after another portion, repeatedly, wherein before each data reduction, the portion that the estimation value thereof is necessary to be recalculated for the predetermined estimation method (necessarily the latter vertex is to be relabeled) as a result of the previous data reductions (in case several contours to be defined in more or less similar images, operator

Art Unit: 2671

intervention can be reduced by using the resulting contour of an image as the start contour for a next image; col. 12, lines 46-52) is defined as a reduction prohibition area (the seed contour is open; the relation between these parameters is constrained by not admitting an oscillatory behavior), and a succeeding data reduction is applied to a portion other than the reduction prohibition area (resampling action and inserted again in the next; col. 11, lines 38-51).

Claim 5, Lobregt teaches the reduction prohibition area (an open contour) is released (vertices are repeatedly removed) if a predetermined condition is satisfied (satisfactory results; col. 11, lines 9-19; lines 37-51).

Claims 6 and 7, Lobregt discloses the predetermined condition is a state that there is no portion to be deformed by converging vertices (an edge segment is divided into two shorter ones of equal length... to be relabeled; col. 11, lines 37-49); the predetermined condition is a state that a predetermined number of data reduction are completed (satisfactory results; col. 11, lines 42-51).

Claim 8 recited as an apparatus for reducing 3D data, claim 8 is rejected with the rationale of the rejection of method claim 1.

Claim 15, the rationale provided in the rejection of claims 1 and 4 are incorporated herein.

Claims 17-19, the rationale provided in the rejection of claims 5-7 are incorporated herein.

Claim 20, Lobregt teaches a minimum estimation value calculator which calculates a minimum estimation value (the energy function reaches a minimum;

Art Unit: 2671

col. 1, lines 9-18; col. 4, lines 7-16), a comparator for comparing the minimum estimation value with a permissible value (col. 11, lines 31-36); determining a portion (contour) having the minimum estimation value as a portion to be converged when the minimum estimation value is equal or below the permissible value (col. 13, lines 53-56).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3, 14, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lobregt (5,559,901) in view of Garland et al. "Surface Simplification Using Quadric Error metrics".

Claims 3, 14, 21 and 22, Lobregt does not teach the polygon model

includes a number of triangular polygons; however, Garland teaches the polygon model includes a number of triangular polygons ("We assume that the model consists of triangles only...", page 1, paragraph 4; fig. 1); the portion to be converged is an edge of a triangular polygon ("our simplification algorithm is based on iterative contraction of vertex pairs", page 2, column 2, paragraph 3 and fig. 10); the portion to be converged is a surface of a triangular polygon (fig. 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the triangular polygons taught by Garland into

Art Unit: 2671

the deformation process of Lobregt for data reduction, because the triangle is the most common form of polygons, this implies no loss of generality and would achieve more reliable results (see section 1 Introduction, page 1, paragraph 4).

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 2, 9-13 and 16 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art does not teach the estimation value is an error ϵ defined by the claimed equation.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 8 and 15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The rejection of independent claims has been modified in this Office action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimbinh T. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-9683. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 7:00 AM to 4:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday from 7:00 AM to 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Zimmerman, can be reached at (703) 305-9798.

Art Unit: 2671

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

September 20, 2004



Kimbinh Nguyen

Patent Examiner AU 2671
